

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROSEANNE SAKAMOTO,

No. C 03-5499 SI

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL ON  
RETALIATION**

v.

STEPHEN JOHNSON, Administrator, U.S.  
Environmental Protection Agency,

Defendant.

On March 19, 2007, plaintiff filed a motion for a new trial on her retaliation claim. (Docket No. 473). Plaintiff again contends that the special verdict form was confusing,<sup>1</sup> and also that the jury's verdict was against the weight of evidence regarding plaintiff's claim that Fong retaliated against her by excessively scrutinizing her work.

As the Court stated in its March 15, 2007 order, the Court finds that the special verdict form and jury instructions properly instructed the jury regarding plaintiff's retaliation claim. The Court also notes that plaintiff did not object to the verdict form or the jury instructions. The Court also finds that the jury's verdict was not contrary to the clear weight of the evidence because defendant put on credible evidence of non-retaliatory reasons for scrutinizing plaintiff's work.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 3, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff raised this same contention in her unsuccessful motion to amend the judgment. The Court denied that motion by order filed March 15, 2007.

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28